



## PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

**Present:** Chris Renbarger, Armine Derdarian, Cesar Flores, Ishita Edwards, Jonas Crawford, Jose Vega, Leo Orange, Rainer Mack, Tom O’Neil, Everardo Rivera, Amparo Medina, Berenice Rodriguez, Gabriela Rodriguez, Oscar Cobian, Carolyn Inouye, Linda Fa’asua, Jessica Espitia, Art Sandford

**Absent:** None

**Guests:** Amy Edwards, Christine Morla, Leah Alarcon, Mckayla Segovia

Meeting Date: **11/20/19**

Review of Action Notes: **10/16/19**

Recorded By: Amparo Medina

**AN = Action Needed**

**AT = Action Taken**

**D = Discussion**

**I = Information Only**

- The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m.

	TOPIC		DISCUSSION	ACTION NEEDED	ACCJC STANDARD
I.	Welcome / Call to Order	I	The meeting was called to order at 2:06pm.		
II.	Adoption of the Agenda	AT	<b>T. O’Neil moved to approve the agenda. I. Edwards seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.</b>		
III.	Public Comments	I	None		
IV.	Review of Meeting Minutes and Action Items	I	The Committee reviewed the minutes of the October 16, 2019 meeting.		

		AT	<b>E. Rivera moved to approve the minutes, T. O’Neil seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.</b>		
V.	LA HVAC Building Update	I, D	<p>C. Renbarger stated that the LA-19 HVAC successfully installed. Future meeting with A. Ainsworth and B. Sube on Friday (11/22/2019) to schedule plan for installation in Summer 2020 for the remainder of the LA building. No feedback from faculty to date. C. Renbarger asked for committee to be aware of any feedback.</p> <p>Possible expansion to other buildings and classrooms but this year only concentrating on LA Building</p> <p>D. Eberhardy asked if student interns would be included on the project. C. Renbarger confirmed - yes.</p>		III.B
VI.	College Council – A. Sandford	I	<p>Handout: College Council</p> <p>During 2016 Accreditation visit, it was brought to the college’s attention by the visiting team that there are 2 committees with “planning” in their title, PEPC and PBC. It was also pointed out that they did not see a lot of planning on either of the two committees. Need to have one body that is the ultimate planning recommending body. President Sanchez would look favourably upon the creation of college council.</p> <p>College Council would subsume the role of the planning portion of PBC and would be the forum for staff, faculty, and administration to gather and express opinions, initiatives, etc. and make recommendations to the President. Would be a PG Committee. Would be set up as tri-chairs. Would become the last stop before approving strategic plan, educational master plan, program discontinuance etc.</p>		IV.A
VII.	Committee Charge & Membership	I	<p>Handout: Fiscal Review Committee</p> <p>All purpose and activities bullet points are different from the current PBC purpose and activities. Successor committee to PBC would be a Fiscal Review Committee or Budget Committee. Prefers “fiscal” over “budget” as “budget” is limiting, doesn’t deal</p>		IV.A

with spending, purchasing or procedures dealing with fiscal oversight in general.

Purpose of Financial Review Committee would be on fiscal health and sustainability. Transparency in budgeting, transparency in spending. Anything that has a FOAP attached could be up for discussion.

Reviewed proposed FRC Membership

- Proposal of 2 AFT members – Why additional AFT rep? Idea is about budget transparency and fiscal transparency. Believes bargaining units have a big stake in this issue.
- C. Renbarger – we can certainly make decisions that go beyond what the current union contracts state. Current contracts require 1 AFT rep and no SEIU Reps.
- R. Mack - Too many people.
- D. Eberhardy - Discussion in PG Workgroup that committees where the dialogue and vetting take place, it is important to have a large well informed committee. College council would be a smaller group.
- J. Crawford – Fiscal review committee was 8 people and got more work done than a group of 24.
- E. Rivera (AFT Rep) – ok with keeping at 1 AFT

R. Mack - How does FRC relate to PEPC? A. Sandford – Current proposal is to have PEPC to become Program Review Committee (PRC) and concentrate on program reviews. Coordinating the process, refining the process, modifying it as needed.

Thoughts about taking PBC and separating into college council and a fiscal or budget?

- R. Mack - great idea.

- I. Edwards – Finance Resource Committee was in place prior to PBC
- T. O’Neil believes committee membership proposal is too big. Has worries over there being too many committees and confusion regarding the individual focus.
- A. Derdarian – how will the communication from budget committee happen to the college council? D. Eberhardy - Chairs will be on the college council.
- E. Rivera asked for AFT to be added to College Council – D. Eberhardy advised they have added AFT rep in latest draft.
- A. Medina posed question of membership, as this number seems too large for FRC proposal.

C. Renbarger summarized the proposal as follows:

- Calls for broader representation. This current proposed membership size is too large;
- Specification of number unnamed, but that collectively, it was agreed that half of the proposed number of members is reasonable. Unanimously Agreed.
- Will need an odd number. Suggested 6 faculty, 1 AFT, 3 Classified, 2 managers, 1 student. D. Eberhardy believes it is imperative that we designate an academic manager on PRC and on FRC.

ASG requesting 2 voting members. L. Orange pointed out committee would be reducing faculty and increasing students. M. Lopez – need to realize we have a lot of students. In ASG, 1 student represents 1000 students. Faculty speaks for faculty. Who speaks for all students? D. Eberhardy suggested having 1 voting student, but 2 students on the committee. Want to make sure all of the voices are at the table. Voting is not necessary to have a voice. Role of all members is to argue and present ideas

and convince other people to see it our way. A. Medina – understands proposal would reduce faculty members, however she pointed out community colleges throughout the state have more than one student sitting at the table. Grossmont College has 3 representatives across the board which includes students. Asked ASG reps if there have been any concerns with filling seats on committees. M. Lopez – No, students are so concerned about student representation that they make an effort to make sure students are present.

Consensus decision making

D. Eberhardy - One shared premise. Do what's the best for Oxnard College students, staff, and faculty. If we understand that to be the premise for all of our PG committees, it would change the mindset from the "us versus them" mentality. A. Medina clarified that with consensus voting, when there is a motion made, if there are one or two people who don't agree, then you see what modifications can be made to agree to the motion but if not agreed upon, it will not move forward. A. Edwards – not consensus in the traditional form. Not unanimous, not majority. Instead somewhere in the middle. C. Renbarger – the other component was at the College Council, if all members of one constituency said no, the motion cannot move forward.

A. Edwards – additional issues with the proxies. One faculty member cannot hold all proxies.

C. Flores – When doing a scope and analysis of who should be serving, if members will be appointed annually, concerned with areas that may be excluded. Be mindful of this when minimizing membership.

G. Rodriguez – Sees a lot of resistance in the room from members when discussing increased seats for ASG reps. Understands it has been an issue in the past of students not filling their seats. Current student reps are doing an amazing job. Anybody who feels they are losing seats, can have the same impact by showing up to meetings, same as was advised to students. Not opposed to having 2 students on committee.

			<p>D. Eberhardy. Concern that has to be addressed is accreditation. If 2 students are given seats and they are not showing up, accreditors will say there is a document that we are managing the college by, but it is not being followed. Could put us in a difficult situation. Imperative that if you have any concerns, whether you are a voting member or not, that you attend the meetings.</p> <p>R. Mack doesn't believe there is resistance to having more ASG reps, it's more that we had made the decision that it was important to reduce the numbers and the mechanism for that was divide everything in half.</p> <p>A. Derdiarian commended this year's student participation</p> <p>A. Sandford – supports two students being on the committee. One voting/one no-voting.</p>		
VIII.	North & South Hall Presentation	I	<p>Handout</p> <p>C. Renbarger - Previous meeting there was interest in fulfilling prior resource request to update or expand the Art facilities, which could mean replacing or bringing back South Hall and possibly fixing up North Hall. Motion made last meeting for additional information with price quotes. Asked R. Mack and C. Morla to put together a presentation. Components from B. Sube are possibilities on where buildings can go and some information on where existing infrastructure is and what additional infrastructure may need to be put into place, primarily having to do with plumbing.</p> <p>Installing modular classrooms in the South Hall space. Only space with plumbing.</p> <p>A. Derdiarian asked what the proposed square footage would be. (8400 sq. ft.)</p> <p>J. Crawford noted that the proposal does not include the cost to renovate the McNish Gallery; only inclusive of points.</p>		III.B

Approximate cost for each modular room is \$100,000 plus IT Costs. May be additional costs for installing

In terms of budget, approx. \$1.5 million. Furniture component is a separate line item not included in \$1.5 million.

- Total cost estimate \$2 million

C. Renbarger clarified the 'renovate' and 'remodel' terminology per the building codes.

Foundation has wanted to gift a building for art facilities for several years now.

**A. Medina – Motion to recommend North Hall proposal to President. Seconded by G. Rodriguez.**

- Edwards asked to have the foundation confirm a donation. E. Garcia wanted to move the question forward to take a vote. D. Eberhardy noted that the funds are in a specific and different fund.
- Other programs may wish to contribute a proposal for their areas. A. Derdiarian asked if there were any other areas that have provided a proposal.
  - D. Eberhardy confirmed Marine Biology has requested.
  - J. Crawford stated that Athletics has requested stadium lights for athletics fields for ten years.
  - T. O'Neil stated that Marine is in discussion with CSU for pairing up and adding onto their facility. The program has no idea of the outcome without confirmation from CSU. Building proposals were discussed at one time, and would appreciate ability to denote a proposal towards building with boating center.
- A. Edwards reminded that the age of the North Hall building, and that this is one of many proposals to be

			<p>discussed in the future. All may be collected and proposed for future decision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Inouye suggested the committee move the proposal forward with motion to vote as presented. This proposal is a stand-alone item and needs to move forward. It would then be up to President and executive team to decide and discuss funding process.</li> </ul>		
		AT	<p><b>A. Medina motioned to recommend proposal for new art facilities to the President. Seconded by G. Rodriguez. Motion passed unanimously.</b></p>		
IX.	Budget/Budget Book	I	<p>Additional \$5.7 million in funds from state. District won't receive until February. Vice Chancellor El Fattal recommended to Board to disperse half immediately to colleges and Board approved. Equates to \$549,000 for Oxnard College. Transferred into budget this week. Need to discuss plans on how to spend money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. Flores asked to revisit resource requests that have been denied in prior academic years. J. Crawford agrees and would like to revisit previous requests.</li> <li>• C. Inouye stated that the ranked Resource Requests from previous fiscal year should be reviewed for funding. Ex, equip funds were limited IELM; prioritized requests that were not funded, start with those and move forward.</li> <li>• A. Derdarian discussed IT in Dental building, mandatory priority due to wires crossing sink areas. Electrical hazard. Technology was not installed correctly. \$200,000 for IT taken from DH and IT issues never taken care of.</li> <li>• L. Webb asked if this is a one-time funding. C. Renbarger confirmed.</li> </ul>		III.D

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Sandford added comment that we've had to back fill - substitute costs and hiring full time replacement. \$30,000 in substituting.</li> </ul> <p>A. Medina will send previous two years resource requests for review and we will discuss in future PBC meetings.</p> <p>C. Renbarger - Can't use additional funding as a basis for permanent personnel</p>	<b>(AN) A. Medina to email previous resource requests spreadsheets to committee</b>	
X.	December Meeting		December 11 <sup>th</sup> , modification of meeting schedule		
XI.	Follow-up Items for Next Meeting	I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional State Funds</li> <li>Past Resource Requests</li> </ul>		
XII.	Future Meeting Dates	I	<p>The next Planning &amp; Budget Committee date is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>December 11, 2019</li> <li>January 15, 2020</li> <li>February 19, 2020</li> <li>March 18, 2020</li> <li>April 15, 2020</li> <li>May - TBD</li> </ul>		
XIII.	Adjournment		The meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.		

Handouts:

College Council Proposal  
Fiscal Review Committee Proposal  
Proposal for New Art Facilities